

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 5, 12, 13, 17, and 31 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-34 and 36-38 remain pending in this application.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for being in an improper dependent form. Applicant has amended claim 5 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 5 is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Mahany, and U.S. Patent No. 5,678,171 (Toyama). Podowski, Hendricks, and Mahany are all of record. The Examiner states:

With regard to Claim 1, Podowski discloses a communication system for a mobile platform ... Podowski fails to disclose providing order wire data ...

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses providing order wire data ... a video for playback being a storage unit ... for the purpose of enabling control information to be transmitted to the video source.

Additionally, in an analogous art, Mahany discloses a short-range transceiver ... furthermore, in an analogous art, Toyama discloses a mobile platform ... comprising a satellite receiver.

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski to include providing order wire ... information for controlling a source of video for playback being a storage unit as taught by Hendricks, for the purpose of enabling control information to be transmitted to the video source in a communication system for a mobile platform.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski and Hendricks to include a short-range transceiver, as taught by Mahany, for the purpose of minimizing power consumption in a communication system for a mobile platform.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski, Hendricks, and Mahany to include a satellite receiver, as taught by Toyama, for the purpose of receiving satellite broadcast data in an airplane.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Podowski, Hendricks, Mahany, and Toyama are referred to below as the cited art.

Independent claim 1 recites a communication system that utilizes order wire data. The order wire data is stored in the storage unit on the mobile platform and controls the source of video for playback being either the storage unit or the satellite or both the storage unit and the satellite. As specifically recited in claim 1, the order wire data is received on the same transceiver that receives the video data that is stored on the mobile platform. A separate satellite receiver is also located on the mobile platform. The recited structure provides significant advantages for mobile platforms, such as airplanes, where coordinating sources of video with destinations and schedules can be difficult. By providing the order wire data with the video data at the docking area, the mobile platform is ensured of receiving its most critical data for the program rather than being susceptible to breaks in communications while mobile.

The Examiner admits the Podowski does not disclose order wire data, the focus of claim 1. Further, Podowski does not teach the use of order wire data that used to control the

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

source of the program. Therefore, Podowski cannot possibly provide a suggestion for order wire data that is received by the same receiver that receives video data for storage and controls the playback of the program from a satellite receiver and/or the stored video data.

The Examiner relies on Hendricks for a discussion of order wire data. Although Hendricks discloses an operation center 202 that controls a head end for video playback, digital operation center 202 is not associated with a storage unit in a mobile platform. Indeed, in Hendricks, the operation center 202 is associated with the cable company, a location far away from where the video is actually played (at the home). As shown in figure 2 of Hendricks, operation center 202 is completely separated from where the location of the playing of the video at 207. In fact, following the teaching of Hendricks, one of ordinary skill in the art would use an operation center 202 remote from the mobile platform to control whether the communication system should receive a video signal from the satellite or from on board storage. This is completely contrary to the principles of the present invention.

Applicant notes that the section cited in column 18 of Hendricks relates to the storage of set top terminal control information stream and is not related to choosing the video source for the program. Again, Hendricks does not disclose the selection of the source for the data of the program. At most, it provides additional scheduling and description of programs. However, this is not choosing the source of the program being either from the set top terminal, the satellite or both. Indeed, its only selection is from the cable for the program. Further, there is no capability of choosing from a program exclusively from the set top box or both from the set top box in the memory.

In further contrast to the explicit language of claim 1, the set top box of Hendricks is a single receiver that can only receive signals from the cable input. The same receiver used to receive the menu and scheduling information is the same receiver used to receive the program information. Therefore, Hendricks does not suggest two receivers, one for receiving order wire data and video data to be stored and a second for receiving satellite transmissions.

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

Mahany merely discloses a microLAN device and does not disclose the deficiencies of Hendricks and Podowski. Similarly, Toyama discloses a satellite source and does not disclose the deficiencies of Hendricks and Podowski. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10, and 11 are patentable over the cited art.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Mahany and Toyama and further in view of Galipeau. Galipeau is of record. The Examiner states:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski to include the mobile platform is a train, as taught by Galipeau.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable from the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Mahany and Galipeau do not disclose or suggest an order wire received on a receiver that provides video data to a storage unit. Therefore, neither Mahany nor Galipeau can overcome the deficiencies of Hendricks, Podowski, Mahany, and Toyama. Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Galipeau if necessary. Therefore, claims 7-9 are patentable over the cited art combined with Galipeau.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Podowski, in view of Mahany and U.S. Patent No. 6,263,503 (Margulis). The Examiner states:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski to include a short-range transceiver, as taught by Mahany, for the purpose of minimizing power consumption in a communication system for a mobile platform.

In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art ... to include a satellite receiver coupled to a processor, configured to receive video data from a satellite, the processor

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

determining whether to use video data from the storage unit or from the satellite receiver, as taught by Margulis, for the purpose of enabling an output video signal to be selected from a plurality of video sources in a communication system for a mobile platform.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 12 recites a wireless transceiver configured to receive the data representative of video and order data. The order wire data controls the generation of the program using data stored in the storage unit or received by the satellite receiver. As discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 1, Podowski and Mahany do not describe, show or suggest such a feature. Similarly, Margulis fails to provide for the deficiency of Podowski and Mahany. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over Podowski, Mahany, and Margulis. Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Margulis if necessary.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Podowski in view of Margulis. The Examiner states:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski to include a satellite receiver coupled to a processor, configured to receive video data from a satellite, the processor determining whether to use video data from the storage unit or from the satellite receiver, as taught by Margulis, for the purpose of enabling an output video signal to be selected from a plurality of video sources in a communication system for a mobile platform.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 13 recites a first means for transmitting a first data including video data and order wire data and a second means for receiving the first data. Claim 13 also recites a fifth means for controlling video data for a program from either the fourth means or the third means to be displayed onboard the mobile platform in response to the order wire data. Therefore, claim 13 is patentable over Podowski and Margulis for the same reasons described above with respect to

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

claim 12. Accordingly, claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-16 are patentable over Podowski and Margulis.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claims 17-22 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) as being unpatentable over Podowski in view of Toyama. The Examiner states:

Podowski fails to disclose receiving video signals from a satellite transmitter by a mobile platform satellite receiver.

In an analogous art, Toyama discloses a mobile platform ... comprising a satellite receiver ...

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Podowski to include a satellite receiver, as taught by Toyama, for the purpose of receiving satellite broadcast data in an airplane.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 17 recites a method of electronically receiving the video data including order wire data with a receiver and displaying video images onboard the mobile platform in accordance with the video data stored on the mobile platform or with video signals received by the mobile platform satellite receiver in response to the order wire data for a program. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-22 and 26-30 are patentable over Podowski and Toyama.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Podowski, Toyama and Galipeau. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 17 and are patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 7-9. Accordingly, claims 23-25 are patentable over Podowski, Toyama and Galipeau.

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, claims 31-33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Podowski in view of Hendricks and Toyama. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 31 recites that the wireless docking area transmitter provides order wire data to the wireless platform receiver and the storage unit stores the order wire data. Video for a program is provided on the mobile platform from the storage unit or a satellite in accordance with the order wire data. Accordingly, claim 31 is patentable over Podowski in view of Hendricks and Toyama for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, claims 31 and its dependent claims 32-33 and 35 are patentable over Podowski, Hendricks and Toyama.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Podowski, Hendricks, and Toyama and further in view of Mahany. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 34 depends from claim 31 and is patentable for the same reasons that claim 31 is patentable as discussed above. Accordingly, claim 34 is patentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Toyama and Mahany.

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, claim 37 is rejected as being unpatentable over Podowski in view of Hendricks and Toyama and further in view of Jerome (Jerome is of record). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 37 is dependent on claim 31. Jerome does not provide for the deficiencies of Podowski, Hendricks, and Toyama. Therefore, claim 37 is patentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Toyama and Jerome for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, claim 37 is patentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Toyama and Jerome.

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

In paragraph 13 of the Office Action, claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Podowski, Hendricks and Toyama as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Miwa. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 38 is dependent upon claim 33 which is dependent upon claim 31. Miwa does not provide for the deficiencies of Podowski, Hendricks and Toyama. Claim 38 is patentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Toyama and Miwa for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 38 is patentable over Podowski, Hendricks, Toyama and Miwa.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 20 Dec 2004By Nathan O Jensen

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
400 Collins Road, NE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-1184
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No. 26383

Nathan O. Jensen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,460